

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 14, 2003 LB 454

Mr. Speaker. And I'm flattered, but the Douglas County program is not mine. And I understand why he mentions that. He means in the county where I live. There is not a great deal more to say about that, other than to make the distinction that the person who goes into that program is not convicted, nor does he or she have to plead guilty first. The agreement is that if you complete this program...because it's...I think it might be 18 months. It's a long time. If you complete this program, it will be as though you never were arrested and brought into the system. All of that is erased. It's not expunging a conviction, because there is none. And the incentive is that you have nothing on your record, you do not go through the criminal justice system, there is no conviction. It's as though none of this ever happened. Under Senator Aguilar's program, you must plead guilty, and you have that on your record. Even there, the incentive to complete the program is to avoid going back to the sentencing court and being sent to jail on the original drug offense. There is no need for another hammer. If we go out of here and the temperature outside is 105 degrees, it doesn't matter if they raise it to 110 degrees, because after you reach a certain point, the piling on is not going to be that noticeable. So the hammer is there. We're being asked to modify our laws, to conduct our legislating, based on what some judge out there in central Nebraska is transmitting to Senator Aguilar. I think a message needs to be sent to that judge, and a message needs to be sent to our colleagues. When we bring something to the floor, we should be prepared to defend that. We should be prepared to answer questions. And it should not be based on what some judge continues to say. Well, if that is done, then do this. If this is done, go over there and do the other. Although we're on my amendment, and Senator Stuthman has given me time, if you look at the gadget, you will see that there has been a cleanup of my amendment. A period would not be placed after the word "recidivism." But there are some words that would be stricken after "recidivism." And Senator Doug Cunningham did what a lot of people don't do all the time. He read the amendment and saw where it would not make sense if a period were put after "recidivism." So on the mike I want to thank Senator Cunningham for bringing that to my attention, and for the efficient legislative staff in cleaning up the amendment. The essence of it has not changed. But I want to